

REMARKS

The courtesy of a telephone interview with the Examiner on April 21, 2005, is gratefully acknowledged. The Examiner indicated that all of the claims appear to be in condition for allowance with the exception of claim 15. After discussion with the Examiner, it appears that the language of claim 15 could be improved in order to make the claimed subject matter more clear. This has been done by deleting claim 15 and adding new claim 18. In addition, claim 11 has been amended in order to correct an error in that claim.

With regard to new claim 18, this claim specifies the feature of the present invention, wherein only a single wind drive unit is mounted at each axial position along the drive shaft. Claim 18 has been drafted in order to make it clear that each drive unit includes oppositely facing wind catchers mounted 180 degrees apart on opposite sides of the drive shaft and includes no intervening wind catchers that can block or otherwise interfere with wind flow against other wind catchers at the same axial position on the drive shaft. When wind catcher elements are positioned at more than these two angular positions at any one axial position on the drive shaft, the wind flow against wind catchers at one angular position will block or interfere with wind flow across a wind catcher that is partially shielded or behind that wind catcher. The disturbance in wind flow affects the efficiency of the drive unit.

The cited Potter reference (U.S. Patent No. 4,382,191) has four wind catcher elements spaced 90 degrees apart at each of two axial positions on the drive shaft. The cited Black reference (U.S. Patent No. 4,321,005) has eight wind catcher elements at each axial position on the drive shaft, with the wind catcher elements being spaced 45 degrees apart. In both of these systems, wind flow against upwind wind catchers will partially block and interfere with wind flow against downwind wind catchers that are partially behind the upwind wind catchers.

It is believed that none of the references disclose the apparatus new claim 18, and that this claim also is condition for allowance.

If the Examiner has additional concerns about new claim 18, a telephone interview with Applicant's attorney would be appreciated, in order to resolve this matter expeditiously.

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas W. Horjus

Dated: 4/22/05

By: John A. Waters
John A. Waters, Reg. No. 24,802
VARNUM, RIDDERING, SCHMIDT & HOWLETT LLP
Bridgewater Place
Post Office Box 352
Grand Rapids, Michigan 49501-0352
(616) 336-6000